Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.—Not yet, Sir.

Sri S. SRINIVASA IYENGAR.—Will they atleast remind the Central Government in view of the urgency of the matter ?

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.—Recently when I was in Delhi, I had a talk with the Central Government. I will speek to them once again.

Sri S. SRINIVASA IYENGAR.—The Government have stated in answer to clause (*b*) of question No. 829 page 4 of the list—as"may be". I believe, Sir, the question of opinion cannot be an answer to the question. "May be" signifies an opinion. Can the opinion be an answer to a question, Sir ? I request the Hon'ble Speaker to direct the Government to give specific answers to questions.

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.—I will take note of the suggestion, Sir.

QUESTION FOR ANSWERS ON THE DAY.

(but not taken up)

Coffee Board Class III Employees.

Q.—678 Sri D. VENKATESH. (Gandhinagar).—

Will the Government be pleased to state:—

(*a*) whether there was any industrial dispute conciliated upon by the Chief Conciliator in Mysore with regard to demand placed by Class III employees of the Coffee Board, Mysore State ;

(*b*) when the conciliation ended ;

(*c*) whether it is a fact that the report of the Conciliation Officer although sent by the Labour Department was not received by the Secretariat ;

(*d*) whether the party approached the Government repeatedly for an Order of Reference of their dispute to a tribunal ?

A.—Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO (Minister for Law and Education).—

(*a*) Yes.

(*b*) 2nd May 1956.

(*c*) The report stated to have been sent was not received in the Secretariat.

(*d*) No

Business of the House

Sri Mulka GOVINDA REDDY (Chitaldrug).—Sir, very important Bills are pending before this House, especially the Second Amendment Bill regarding the Tenancy Law and the University Bill. Nearly more than a year ago the Tenancy Second (Amendment) Bill was introduced and for the last two sessions it is not being discussed. We are very much interested to see that that bill is gone through. We would like to know when that Bill is going to be taken up as also the University Bill which has been referred to the Select Committee. The Select Committee has not yet submitted its report to the House. Further, we would like to know the future programme of this House, whether the session is going to be continued, if not, when it is going to be held. We are anxious to see that before the new State comes into existence, all the unfinished business should be finished.

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO. (Minister for Law and Education).—Sir, with regard to the Select Committee report on the Mysore University Bill, 1955, we have sent the report for printing; as soon as it is received from the press, we will place it on the Table of the House. The Government is anxious to push through the Bills with the co-operation of the House. Regarding the Tenancy Bill, because the financial matter was pending before the House, it could not be pursued Sir, It will also be pursued.

Sr J. MOHAMED IMAM (Jagalur).—The members of this House are anxious to know whether we are going to meet at Mysore or at Bangalore. Because we are also persons with numerous engagements, and we have to adjust our

programme according to the programme of the House. I am surprised to note that the Government is taking so much time to take a decision with regard to the holding of a session.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA (Minister for Home and Finance).—The Hon'ble the Leader of the Opposition is already home-sick. We have been here for the last one week.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Next item on the agenda will be taken up.

MYSORE KHADI AND VILLAGE INDUSTRIES BILL, 1956.

Motion to Consider.

Dr. R. NAGAN GOWDA (Minister for Industries and Excise).—

Sir, I move:

"That the Mysore Khadi and Village Industries Bill, 1956 as reported by the Select Committee, be taken into consideration."

The printed copies of the report are before the members. I, without making any speech, move this for consideration.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Motion moved:

"That the Mysore Khadi and Village Industries Bill, 1956, as reported by the Select Committee, be taken into consideration."

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM (Jagalur).—Sir, I expected that changes that would be made could be acceptable to those who opposed this Bill. On the other hand, I find that they have made matters worse and confirmed my suspicion that this is a piece of legislation intended not to benefit the country or to uplift it or improve the material wealth of the State but to strengthen their own organisation. Sir, last time I expressed my apprehension that the measure is to the benefit of only those who are in power intended to strengthen and stabilise their party. I also stated that the Chairman and members of this Board may come from one party and this is more or less an organisational move rather than an administrative one. Now, the Select Committee have made one change which I think, is against the Constitution and which must receive the serious consideration of this House. That is the clause of disqualification which lays down that no member of the Board or the Chairman can be appointed unless he wears khadi. I should not be misunderstood that I am against khadi or wearing khadi. But, I feel that khadi movement at present is out of date. It is purely organisational. It should be taken over by a private organisation and should not be the concern of the Government. At the most, Government may subsidise the scheme and give some grant. I object to make this a part of Government machinery. Tomorrow it may be said that those who do not wear khadi cannot become Government servants. This is highly objectionable and highly discriminatory My friend Sri Pattabhiraman, to whom I have great respect was also in the Select Committee, and they ought not to have added this disqualification. On these grounds I very strongly oppose this Bill. Even now I appeal to the Minister not to introduce such a discriminatory measure. We all love khadi. Let Government encourage the industry; we have no objection for their doing it. But, why should they havs this as a statutory measure?

Sir, I know that for the last few years Government have been spending good deal of money and Government of India is now trying to introduce the Ambar Charka under the Second Five-Year Plan. I think they have set apart some crores for this scheme. But I am very much doubtful whether this Ambar Charka Scheme would bring any material benefit to the country and relieve unemployment. On the other hand I am certain that all the money that is to be spent on this scheme by way of subsidy, etc., would all be a waste. I am taking a realistic and a practical view. Supposing this amount of 40 or 50 crores which is proposed to be spent on this Ambar Charka Scheme is diverted to start small mills throughout the country; a number of them can be started at aost of Rs. 8 to 10 lakhs for each mill. We can provide employment